



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,463	09/08/2003	Makarand Gadre	MS1-1596US	9824
22801	7590	09/14/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER WEI, ZHENG	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,463	GADRE, MAKARAND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zheng Wei	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Zheng Wei. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Ninning Xu (Reg#:L0293). (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 25 and 36.


Identification of prior art discussed: Hostetter et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed amendment of claim 25 about 101 issue and explained the reason why the amended claim recites terms data structure/representation of source code are still considered non-statutory. Discussed the proposed amended limitations in claims 1 and 36 that make the terms more clear.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**TUAN DAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.....10/657,463  
Filing Date .....Sep 8, 2003  
First Named Inventor .....Makarand Gadre  
Assignee .....Microsoft Corporation  
Group Art Unit .....2192  
Examiner .....Zheng Wei  
Attorney's Docket No. ....MS1-1596US  
Title .....Compiling Source Code Using Generic Classes

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION IN PREPARATION FOR  
SCHEDULING AN INTERVIEW

To: Examiner Wei  
Fax: (571) 270-2059

From: Kasey Christie  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201  
ningning@leehayes.com  
(Tel. 509-324-9256; Fax 509-323-8979)

Dear Examiner Wei:

**[0001]** This communication provides an agenda for a phone interview of this matter. My assistant will be contacting you to schedule an interview. If you would prefer to schedule the interview, then please contact my assistant or me directly. Our contact info is on the signature page of this document. Thank you in advance to talking with me about this matter.

**INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file****Interview Agenda:**

- Discussion about § 101 issue
- Discussion of difference between claims and cited art
- Discussion of proposed amendments

**Section 101**

**[0002]** Claim 25 is amended as follows:

25. (Currently amended) A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a ~~[[data-structure]]~~ representation of source code for use by a compiler, the ~~[[data-structure]]~~ representation comprising:

....

**[0003]** With this amendment to the specification, the reasoning for the § 101 rejection provided on p. 2 of the Action is no longer applicable. Right? If not, then please explain why not.

**Exemplary Differences**

**[0004]** Claim 1 is amended to recite as follows (Emphasis added):

1. (Currently amended) A method of generating common intermediate language code comprising:

receiving a portion of JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language source code referencing a first class having a definition that is uniformly applicable to a plurality of classes associated with the first class, the source code identifying one of the plurality of associated classes; and

generating language-neutral intermediate language code representing the portion of JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language source code and

**INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file**

source code referred to in the first class and written in language other than JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language.

**[0005]** It does not appear to me that primary cited reference (i.e., Hostetter) discloses the amended feature in claim 1 (the language-neutral intermediate language “[represents] the portion of JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language source code and source code referred to in the first class and written in language other than JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language”).

**[0006]** Hostetter is directed to a compiling method, wherein template-generated classes in program code are compiled through a process of lazy compilation, thus improving the compilation time during execution. According to Hostetter, with the template-generated classes, the unnecessary object code results are never invoked during the execution. Hostetter further introduced lazy compilation, which delays compilation of a referenced method until the class method is invoked by the execution of a method call instruction. However, all the teachings in Hostetter for compiling source code are based on JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language. Hostetter does not teach compiling JAVA language source code to a “language-neutral intermediate language” that represents “the portion of JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language source code and source code referred to in the first class and written in language other than JAVA<sup>TM</sup> language.”

**[0007]** Claim 36 is amended as follows:

36. (Currently amended) A method of generating microprocessor-executable code comprising:

receiving a portion of source code written in a first language for which generic classes are unspecified, the portion of

**INFORMAL COMMUNICATION: Please do not put in the file**

source code including a generic class declaration declaring a generic class, the generic class declaration including at least one associated class reference defining a constructed class of the generic class, the generic class being defined in a source code written in a second language other than the first language; and

generating a module having microprocessor-executable instructions corresponding to the constructed class, the module further having metadata describing the constructed class.

**[0008]** Similar to claim 1, since Hostetter only teaches to compile source code written in JAVA language, Hostetter does not disclose to generate a module from a portion where “a generic class [is] defined in a source code written in a second language other than the first language.”

**[0009]** I look forward to talking to you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 30, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Kasey Christie  
Reg. No. 40,559  
(509) 324-9256 x232  
ningning@leehayes.com  
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica  
(509) 324-9256 x264  
carly@leehayes.com